REMARKS

1.   Claim Amendments.

Applicant has introduced into all of the claims the limitation that the unencrypted start section of the user data is placed immediately after the header. This amendment is supported, at least, by page 17, second paragraph, lines 11 and 12 of the specification that accompanied the first preliminary amendment dated August 15, 2001.

Applicant has also amended all claims by stating that the start section is, indeed, an unencrypted start section which includes "the" first part of the user data rather than "a" first part of the user data. This case has been suggested by the Examiner in the recent Office Action, page 3, line 14.

Additionally, Applicant has amended Claim 6 so that this claim is directed to a method for playing back an encrypted <u>user</u> data stream.

Claim 18 is no longer necessary. Therefore, Applicant has deleted this claim.

Furthermore, Applicant has amended Claims 6 and 13 so that the header includes an information which is <u>sufficient</u> to play back the unencrypted start section. This amendment is supported by page 18, second and third paragraphs of the above-mentioned specification. Because only information which is absolutely necessary for playing back the unencrypted start section is processed in the initial processing step and because then, based on this processed information the unencrypted start section is played back, it is clear that this absolutely necessary information is the information sufficient to play back the start section.

2.   Office Action.

In the first paragraph of page 3, of the Office Action, the Examiner more or less suggests that the start section is adjoined to the header. The amended wording in Claim 1, which is literally supported by the specification, has the same meaning

because it says that the unencrypted start section of the user data is placed immediately after the header.

Regarding page 3 second paragraph of the Office Action, the amendment in Claims 6 and 13, *i.e.*, that the header contains information which is sufficient to play back the unencrypted start section, addresses the part with regard to Saito.

The Examiner's attention is drawn to column 8, lines 26 and 27, of Saito where it is outlined that data header to be used to <u>recognize</u> the data are not encrypted. However, recognizing data does not mean that one can play back the data. Thus, when one has recognized the data, the data are not sufficient for playing back the data.

Regarding the third paragraph of page 3 of the Office Action Applicant's claims now have the limitation that the unencrypted start section immediately follows the header.

Regarding the last paragraph of page 3 of the Office Action and the first paragraph of page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner is respectfully requested to refer to the amendments in Claims 6 and 13.

Regarding the second paragraph of page 4, the Examiner refers to the fourth paragraph of page 4 of Applicant's response filed on December 20, 2006. Applicant notes Applicant's typographical error. The word "Examiner" should have been "Applicant." Applicant apologizes for any confusion that this error may have caused.

Regarding the objection against the drawings, enclosed please find an amended Fig. 5.

Regarding the objections against the specification, as well as these under 35 USC 112 in connection with the written description requirement, Applicant has amended Claims 6 and 13 consistent with page 18, second paragraph, of the specification. Accordingly, those rejections are deemed overcome.

Regarding the last paragraph on page 5, Applicant has amended the claims so that the start section includes unencrypted data. Furthermore, throughout the claims, Applicant has stated that the start section is an unencrypted start section. In view of this, Applicant respectfully declines to accept the Examiner's suggestion.

Regarding Claims 7 and 14, Applicant has clarified that what is meant is the information processed in the preceding processing step.

Regarding the objections against Claims 13-16 and 18, Applicant is of the opinion that these objections are fully addressed in view of the claim amendments herein and Applicant's remarks above.

Regarding the other prior art rejections, Applicant notes that they have already been fully addressed in Applicant's earlier submissions in this matter. Further, such rejections pertain to claims which are dependent upon claims that are deemed to be allowable in view of the claim amendments herein. As such, these rejections are deemed to be moot.

Should the Examiner deem it helpful, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Glenn
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22,862

9